

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, 21, and 23-26 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 8, 20, and 22 are canceled by the present response without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14-16, 20-22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,476,833 to Moshfeghi in view of U.S. patent 7,185,290 B2 to Cadiz et al. (herein "Cadiz"). Claims 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moshfeghi in view of Cadiz as applied to claims 1-12, 14, 17-22, and 24-26, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,366,919 B2 to O'Kane, Jr. et al. (herein "O'Kane").

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now incorporates limitations from previously pending dependent claims 6 and 8. The other independent claims are similarly amended. The claim features are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The claims as currently written can address a situation in which display sections can be automatically changed. As a non-limiting example, the claims can be particularly applicable to a display, such as a portal page accessed through the internet, for an information item that does not have to be displayed all the time, or that is to be displayed only when required. With the claimed invention the configuration of a display window that is minimized and allocated to that information item can be expanded when a certain condition indicating updating of a display section is satisfied, which will thereby attract the user's attention.

With respect to Figure 15 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a Web page may be divided into multiple sections. Sections that are not significant in an

ordinary state can be minimized, see for example in the state of Figure 15 the Printer Information section 212 and the Document List section 214 are minimized, whereas the Service List section 211 and the Calendar section 210 are maximized. In an operation that can be realized in the claimed invention, certain sections that are minimized can be maximized when they are updated. That is, a minimized frame is automatically maximized when information therein is updated. As a non-limiting example, if the printer information within the minimized Printer Information section 212 is updated, then that Printer Information section 212 is maximized, such as shown for example in Figures 10-12. The user can thereby easily recognize that certain information is updated. The above-noted operation is also discussed in the present specification for example at page 41, lines 7-19.

The claims as amended by the present response clarify that fulfillment of a prescribed condition is determined based on display configuration definition information indicating whether information contained in the current display section has been updated, see for example Figures 5 and 6 in the present specification. Further, with the claimed structure the operation in the present invention can automatically expand a minimized display format, to enhance a visual recognition to attract a user's attention, when information contained in a current display section has been updated.

More particularly, a benefit realized in the claimed invention is to enhance a visual effect of a display without increasing a user's workload.

Moshfeghi is not even directed to a device with a similar objective as in the claimed invention. Specifically, Moshfeghi has an objective to allow a specific group of users to browse markup language documents according to user profile information specifying each user's authorization and preferences. In Moshfeghi depending on the level of authorization of a user, different markup language documents to be browsed can be filtered.

In Moshfeghi, although a certain range of markup language documents are displayed in a sub-window based on a determination result using a user's authorization and preferences, Moshfeghi does not use display configuration definition information indicating whether information contained in the current display section has been updated to perform a determination as to whether the displayed information satisfies a prescribed condition.

That is, in contrast to Moshfeghi, in the claims as written a determination is made whether information to be contained in the current display section satisfies the prescribed condition based on display configuration definition information indicating whether information contained in the current display section has been updated. When that prescribed condition is satisfied and information in the current display section is updated, that current display section is expanded. Moshfeghi does not disclose or suggest any such features.

With respect to the features previously recited in dependent claims 6 and 8, which are now incorporated in each of the independent claims, the outstanding Office Action states:

Regarding dependent claims 6-8, Moshfeghi teaches that display sections are emphasized according to user profile records, i.e., by creating a browser sub-window including specific controls and markup language documents (Col. 21-22, Claim 1, especially (ii)). Further it is suggested in Moshfeghi's disclosure that the display data layout could be modified to expand a particular display section or to position it above other display sections when the prescribed condition is satisfied, because Moshfeghi discloses that the display of controls and data can be resized, rearranged, temporarily hidden, overlapped, minimized, maximized, as windowing layouts well known in the art (Col. 12, l. 18-29).

While Moshfeghi does not explicitly teach resizing and modifying the arrangement of display sections when the prescribed condition is satisfied, Cadiz teaches the automatic display of customized dynamic thumbnails, called tickets, to represent particular information elements such as web pages (col. 4, l. 54-col. 5, l. 16; col. 12 l. 46-col. 13, l. 56). Cadiz teaches that the tickets may display any type of information which is accessible via the internet, and that the ticket includes instructions for how to display particular information, such as changing the color of the displayed information when the file

has been modified (col. 16, 1. 26-col. 17, 1. 5). Cadiz further teaches that the ticket window is resizable and dynamically displays the information, and may show visible alerts and show new information in higher contrast or brightness levels (col. 18, 1. 50-col. 20 1. 20; especially col. 10, 1. 62-col. 20, 1. 20).

Both Moshfeghi and Cadiz are analogous art, since both are directed toward the customized display of internet information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the resizable, dynamic viewer with enhanced visual recognition for information according to prescribed conditions disclosed by Cadiz, to the browser control and authorization system disclosed by Moshfeghi, in order to further customize the display of information and provide for sharing of pre-defined communications access points and information elements between users (Cadiz, col. 4, 1. 35-50).¹

Addressing the above-noted basis for the outstanding rejection, applicants respectfully submit that grounds for rejection is not fully considering the claim features.

The claims specifically recite a current display section for which the prescribed condition is not satisfied is minimized. Further, when the prescribed condition is satisfied and information in that minimized section is updated, then that display section is expanded.

One feature in the claims as written is that the expansion of the display section results from information in the display section being updated. Applicants respectfully submit no teachings in either Moshfeghi or Cadiz address such features.

The above-noted grounds for rejection recites broad disclosures in Moshfeghi as disclosing that display sections can be resized, rearranged, temporarily hidden, overlapped, minimized, maximized as is well known in the art. Applicants agree it is known in the art to change the size and other properties of a display section. However, the claims do not broadly recite changing the size or arrangement of a display section, but specifically recite making a display section that is originally minimized expanded when that display section is updated.

¹ Office Action of October 4, 2007, pp. 6 and 7.

Clearly the broad disclosures in Moshfeghi of being able to resize or change a layout of a display section is not directed to such features.

Cadiz discloses customized dynamic thumbnails referred to as tickets that can have information therein updated. However, Cadiz does not disclose or suggest that when information within one of the tickets is updated, that such a ticket is expanded from a minimized state.

One basis for the outstanding rejection again cites Cadiz with a broad disclosure that a ticket window is resizable, see particularly Cadiz at column 19, line 33 *et seq.* That disclosure in Cadiz, however, is not directed to the claimed features. The claims do not broadly recite that a size of a display section can be changed. The claims are more specific in reciting that a minimized display section is expanded when information therein is updated. Cadiz does not disclose or suggest such features.

Cadiz further discloses changing a coloring or other appearance within a display section when new or current information is provided therein.² That disclosure in Cadiz is also not directed to the claim features. The claims are more specific than such a disclosure in Cadiz in that the claims specifically recite that a minimized window is expanded when information therein is updated. Changing a coloring as in Cadiz is not directed to expanding the size of a display section when information therein is updated.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit the features clarified in the claims are neither taught nor suggested by either Moshfeghi or Cadiz, and thus the claims as written clearly distinguish over the combination of teachings of Moshfeghi and Cadiz.


Moreover, no teachings in O'Kane were cited with respect to the above-discussed features, and no teachings in O'Kane are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Moshfeghi in view of Cadiz.

² See for example Cadiz at p. 19, line 63 *et seq.*

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
JJK/SNS:sjh

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\24'S\244421\244421US-AM3.DOC